A U M

How plain does it appear that there is not another condition of life so well suited for philosophizing as this in which thou now happenest to be. —MARCUS AURELIUS.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXX March, 1942 No. 5

SOCIAL ORDER

IN these days of sociological speculations, and the constant stream of new books and articles which deal with the problems of government and the future organization of society, theosophists may well reflect on the social implications of their own philosophy. If theosophists themselves are not to be swept away by one or another of the "panaceas" of the hour, and, with half-unconscious irresponsibility, leave without devoted advocates the Wisdom of the Ages, it is above all necessary to cut through the mass of futile theorizing to the core of the social problem, and to think it out in terms of fundamentals.

What are the "social applications" of Theosophy? They are to be found, pre-eminently, in *The Key to Theosophy,* in the Section on "Practical Theosophy," and in various special articles by H. P. Blavatsky and W. Q. Judge. Theosophy has no "political" program, as its students are thoroughly aware, but it does provide, in the unequivocal charge of its Teachers, a *social* program of practical education and individual example which, if followed by individuals, can and will "reform the world," politically as well as in other ways.

Of the articles by H. P. B., "Let Every Man Prove His Own Work," is a treatise on the social question. "The Fall of Ideals" is a similar inquiry into the roots of social injustice and the crimes of man against man. "Our Three Objects," and "The Theosophical Society, its Mission and its Future" apply the philosophy directly to present problems. Then, by William Q. Judge, the following may be considered: "The Signs of this Cycle," "Another Theosophical Prophecy," and "Social and Labor Conditions." There is another article by Mr. Judge which may be regarded as an expansion and further development of the social responsibilities of the Theosophical student, as briefly indicated in *The Key to Theosophy.* This is his "Living the Higher Life," which appeared in two parts in the first volume of the *Path.* As this article has not been reprinted since 1924, and because of its practical bearing on the difficult questions of individual duty and the method of true social reform, it is now again presented to the readers of THEOSOPHY.

LIVING THE HIGHER LIFE

"I have no desire for any other line of life; but by the time I had awakened to a knowledge of this life, I found myself involved by circumstances against which I do not rebel, but out of and through which, I am *determined* to work, neglecting no known duty to others."—*Letter from a Friend.*

THE "Dweller of the Threshold" which stares even advanced occultists in the face and often threatens to overwhelm them, and the ordeals of Chelaship or of probation for Chelaship, differ from each other only in degree. It may not be unprofitable to analyze this Dweller and those ordeals. For our present purpose, it is enough to state, that they are of a triune nature and depend upon these three relations: (1) to our nationality; (2) to our family; and (3) to ourselves. And every one of these three relations is due to the assertion of a portion of our own past Karma, that is to say, to its effects.

Why should we be born in a particular nation and in a particular family? Because of the effect of a particular set of our Karmic attractions, which assert themselves in that manner. I mean that one set of our past Karmas exhaust themselves in throwing us in our present incarnation amidst a particular nation, another set introducing us into a particular family; and a third set serving to differentiate or individualize us from all the other members of the nation or of the family. One of our Eastern proverbs says: "the five children of a family differ like the five fingers of a hand." Unless we look at this difference from this standpoint, it must always appear to us a riddle, a problem too difficult to solve, a mystery, in short, why children born of one family, while they have some traits common to all, should still appear to differ vastly from one another. What applies to the family applies also to the nation, of which families are but units; and also to mankind as a whole, of whom nations are but families or units. The only way to decide the great question of the age, whether the laws of nature are blind and material, or spiritual, intelligent and divine, is, it seems to me, to point out in connection with every subject, the absolutely intelligent and divine manner in which these laws act, and how they force us to realize the economy of nature. This is the only way by which we could become spiritual; and I would, once for all, call upon my co-workers for the cause, to realize at every step of their study, as far as possible, the Divine

---

NOTE.—This article by Wm. Q. Judge first appeared in the *Path* for July and August, 1886.—Editors.

Intelligence thus manifesting itself. Otherwise, how much soever you might believe or take it for granted, that the forces that govern the universe are spiritual, the belief, however deep rooted it might appear, would be of little use to you when you have to pass through the ordeals of Chelaship; and then you are sure to succumb and exclaim that the "Law is blind, unjust and cruel," especially when your selfishness and personality overwhelm you. When once a practical occultist and a learned philosopher met with, what seemed to him a "serious calamity and trial," in spite of himself he exclaimed to me frankly: 'the law of Karma is surely blind, there is no God; what better proofs are needed?" So deep-rooted in human nature is infidelity and selfishness; no one need therefore to be sure of his own spiritual nature. No amount of lip learning will avail us in the hour of need. We have to study the law in all its aspects and assimilate to our highest consciousness,—that which is called by Du Prel super sensuous consciousness—all the data which go to prove and convince us that the Power is spiritual. Look around and see whether any two persons are absolutely identical, even for a time. How intelligent must be the power that ever strives to keep each and every one of us totally different *on the whole,* while, if analyzed, we possess some traits in common, even with the Negro, with whom we are remotely allied.

In this connection I shall refer you to a passage in the article on "Chelas and Lay Chelas" (vide column 1, page 11 of "Supplement to the Theosophist" for July, 1883): "The Chela is not only called to face all latent evil propensities of his nature, but in addition, the whole volume of maleficent power accumulated by the community and nation to which he belongs * * until the result is known." I shall only ask you to apply the same principle to your family relations affecting your present incarnation. Thus seven things are found to secure us a victory, or a sad, inglorious defeat in the mighty struggle known as the Dweller of the threshold and the ordeals of Chelaship: (1) The evil propensities common to ourselves and to our family; (2) those common to ourself and our nation; (3) those common to ourself and to mankind in general, or better known as the weakness of human nature, the fruits of Adam's first transgression; (4 to 6) the noble qualities common to us and to these three; (7) the peculiar way in which the 6 sets of our past Karmas choose or are allowed to influence us now, or their effects in producing in us the present tendency. The adept alone can take the seventh or last mentioned item completely into his own hands; and every mortal who would, as I have since recently begun to reiterate, direct all his

energies to the highest plane possible for him ("Desire always to attain the unattainable"—says the author of "Light on the Path"),—such a mortal, too, could more or less do the same thing as the adept, insofar as he acts up to the rule. Every Chela, and also those who have a desire to be Chelas even, as they suppose secretly, have to do with the first six propensities or influences.

The world is inclined—at least in this Kali Yuga (the Dark Age)—always to begin at the wrong end of anything and direct all its faculties to the perception of effects and not of their causes. So the ideas of "renunciation," "asceticism" and of the "true feeling of universal Brotherhood" (or "mercy," as I call it, in accordance with South Indian Ethics), all of which are compatible with Gnanis, or the most exalted of Mahatmas, all these have come to be recognized by all our Theosophists, in general, as *the means* of progress for a beginner; while the real means of progress for us mortals—duties to our own families and to our own nation, or "kindness" and "patriotism" in the highest and ethical sense of the terms—are discarded. True, from the standpoint of a Jivanmukta, a true friend of humanity, these two Sadhanas are really "selfishness"; still, until we attain that exalted state, these two feelings should be made the ladders for raising ourselves, the means of not only getting ourselves rid of our family defects and natural idiosyncrasies, but also of strengthening in ourselves the noble qualities of our families and of our nation. Until we reach that ideal state where the blessed soul has to make neither good nor bad Karma, we must strive to be constantly doing "good" Karma, in order that we might become Karmaless (nish Karmis).

Let it not be understood at all, that I mean by "family duties" and "National duties," false attachments to the family or to the nation. Family duty consists not in sensuality or pleasure-hunting, but in cultivating and in elevating the emotional nature (the fourth principle), of ourselves and of our family; in being equally "kind," not only to the members of the family, but also to all creatures, and in enjoying all such pleasures of the family life as are consistent with the acquirement of "wealth" (all the means necessary for the performance of Dharma or whole duty) according to the teachings of Valluvar, and in utilizing such pleasure and means for the performance of our duty to our nation. Patriotism consists similarly in theosophising our own nation, in not only getting ourselves rid of our national defects, as well as other members of the nation rid of the same, but also in strengthening in ourselves and in our nation as a whole, all the noble qualities which belong to our nation; in the

enjoyment of the privileges* of the nation and using them as a means for the performance of *Dharma.* If family duties are taken due care of, our duties to the nation and to humanity would, to a great extent, take care of themselves unimpeded. Our national duties, if strictly performed, serve to purify our fifth lower principle of its dross and to establish and develop the better part of it, while the performance of our duty to Humanity or the *realization of universal tolerance and mercy,* purifies the lower (human) stuff in the fifth higher principle and makes it divine, thus enabling us to free ourselves gradually from the bonds of ignorance common to all human beings.

The above assertions, might, at first sight, seem rather bold and untheosophical. But I should venture to state my conviction that the whole edifice of Aryan religions and Aryan philosophy is based upon these principles, and that, on a careful consideration of the subject, the great importance attached to household life (Grihasta ashrama) in that philosophy, would be fully borne out. To my mind no ascetics, no teachers of mankind, however eminent and full of the highest knowledge, are really such good and practical benefactors of humanity as Valluvar, of ancient times, who incarnated on earth for the express purpose, among others, of setting an example of an ideal household life to mortals who were prematurely and madly rushing against the rocks of renunciation, and of proving the possibility of leading such a life in any age however degenerated; or as Ráma, who, even after having become an *avatar-purusha,* came down amidst mortals and led a household life.

It has often been contended that the world has not progressed on *the path,* because *gnanis,* or Mahatmas, have dwindled in their number and greatness, and because it is Kali Yuga, or the dark age, now. Such arguments are due to our mistaking the effects for their causes. The only way to prepare the way for the advent of a favorable Yuga and for the increase of the number and greatness of Mahatmas, is to establish gradually the conditions for the leading of a true household life. I should unhesitatingly state, that that is the duty of earnest Theosophists and real philanthropists.

Is it not conceded by all philanthropists that unselfish labors for humanity can alone relieve us from the ocean of Sainsara (Rebirth), develop our highest potentialities and help us to alchemise our human weakness? Applying the same principle to unselfish discharge of our family and national duties, my position becomes tenable. A Mahatma has, it appears, declared that He has still "patriotism." But

*I use this word "privilege" in its ethical sense; privileges are to the patriot what the "pleasures" are to the family life.

He has not said nor would say, that He has still family "attachments." This proves that He has got out of the defects of the family to which He belongs, while He is only striving to get out of national defects, some of which at any rate cling to Him. A Buddha would say, that He has "mercy," but no "patriotism."

The only effectual way to get out of family defects is to discharge all our duty to our family before leaving it, as ascetics, or before we die. Blessed is he* who, in each of his incarnations, *then and there,* gets rid of the defects of the family into which he is ushered, thereby converts those defects in his parents, brothers and sisters, into noble qualities, thus strengthening and developing the good qualities both of himself and of his family, then strives to be born in the same family again and again, until he himself becomes a Buddha and assists his family to become a family fit for a Buddha to be born into, while he becomes the cream of all the noble qualities of the family without being tainted with its idosyncrasies. A Dugpa (Black Magician) is frequently born in the same family and becomes the cream of all its evil propensities. Here again is the operation of the sublime and divinely intelligent law of universal and natural economy asserting itself. This is beautifully allegorized in the story of a Jivanmukta churning out of the ocean the elixir of life, and leaving the *visha* (the poison, all the evil propensities) for the Dugpas. This is one of the meanings of the allegory. Avoiding all personalities and questionable facts, I shall rely solely upon our Puranas and scriptures to prove that in every family where Adepts and Gnanis are (or choose to be) frequently born, often Dugpas are also born, as a matter of course. Krishna was the greatest of Gnanis and his uncle, Kansa (for our present purpose), was a terrible Dugpa. The five Pandavas had a hundred wicked cousins, the Kauravas. Devas and the whole brood of wicked Asuras were born of the same parent. *Vibhishana* had for his brother, *Ravana* the prince of Dugpas; so had the good Sugriva a brother like Vali. Prahlada had a monster for his father.

Take the case of one who has not done all his duty to his family, before he dies, or before he takes the vows of renunciation and becomes an ascetic. Such ascetics find themselves attracted by the family defects and selfishness of themselves (which hitherto perhaps lay more or less dormant and now become kindled and awakened by the selfishness of the relatives) and are disturbed in the performance of the duties of their new order or *Ashrama,* however unselfish their

*This is the man to be in the family and not of the family like the water on the lotus leaf, making only the good traits of the family the seat of his higher self.

relatives might have been "unconsciously" or unintentionally. In spite of themselves these relatives arrest the progress of the ascetics in whom the family defects become thus strengthend and developed. Such is the mysterious law of attraction. This man must be born again (1) either in the same family, with the family defects strengthened, both in himself and in his family; (2) or in another family. In the first case, the noble qualities of the family are not strengthened and therefore gradually disappear both from him and from the family. In the second case, he becomes an undutiful son, brother or husband, in his new family, firstly because of the natural law of repetition, which, with the terrible Karmic interest, strengthens the tendency in him to disregard duty; secondly because of the "counter family attractions" (or repulsions). Let not this unfortunate wanderer from the post of his family duty console himself with the foolish idea that this tendency would confine its havoc to family traits (good and evil) and to family duties alone. It would extend itself in all directions, wherever it can; it would make him disregard his duties to his nation and to himself (or in other words, to humanity). He would suddenly be surprised to find himself apathetic to his nation and to his highest nature, or to mankind. Such are the mazes and unknown ramifications of our evil or good propensities. Any evil or noble element of human nature converts itself, under "favorable" conditions into any other element however apparently remote. The conditions are there ready wherever the element is strong; where there is a will there is a way. Performance of family duties therefore develops patriotism and mercy.

I do not at all mean to say that the effects of Karma *always* assert themselves in the same shape or form; but they often might and do. Nor do I mean that the affinities above stated, blossom and ripen in the incarnation immediately succeeding; they might develop ten or even one hundred incarnations after; but in such a case, the Karma only accumulates enormous interest. The affinities might not develop *at the same time* in both him and her, who was once his wife; if they did at the same time, the account could be easily settled,—otherwise, woe to him and to her! Supposing that the attractions for him are developed in her, while the attachments for her are not developed in him at the same time; the result might be, that she pines and languishes for him, sends her poisonous darts consciously or "unconsciously" against him; if these arrows do not kindle the corresponding nature in him, for the time being they frustrate his achievements in other directions. Supposing by the time the affinities in him are developed, he becomes an initiate and she becomes, (let us suppose)

his pupil (male or female). If at the time the pupil's affinities have become converted into devotion for the initiate, the latter becomes blinded in his philanthropic work and noble duties of a sage, and commits, through the infatuation of a love for the pupil, serious blunders, which result in a catastrophe to both of them and to humanity: and both the pupil and initiate fall down and have to mount their rugged pathway again with increased difficulties in their way.

Once, in an age and in a country, when and where household life continues to be ideal, one single wretch commits the first act of transgression by impetuously rushing into the circle of ascetics, or by dying before wholly discharging his duty to his family, the natural result is that both himself, his family, and his nation, become thereby seriously affected. The Akasa* becomes affected by the impulse to transgress in this direction; this impulse forces itself gradually (with accumulated interest, redoubled force) upon others; the ignoble example becomes a precedent; other cases of a like nature follow in quick succession. In course of time, (just when a sad descending cycle begins, such is the divine intelligence of the law that economizes energies and makes things fit it) the leading of the ideal family life becomes almost impossible and very rare; the whole community is thus ruined. Learned and great adepts retire to other spheres (where there then is an ascending cycle) and leave the nation to be swallowed by a cataclysm after ages of degradation and vice.

Let us now reverse this case, and suppose that in the most degenerate nation, in the darkest of cycles, one philanthropist becomes unselfish and intelligent enough to set a noble and intelligent example by fulfilling all family duties; then, as naturally as in the preceding case, the precedent gradually gains acceptance; the way is paved for the advent of an ascending cycle; Gnanis bless the noble man and come down from other unfavorable spheres, where descending cycles begin to dawn.

Now it may be easy to understand why Chelas and lay Chelas (who have not yet thrown off their family defects and thus become the cream of their family's good qualities) are told to be careful lest they become Dugpas (Black Magicians).

I will ask you to apply the same kinds of arguments to the necessity for performing (and the failure to perform) our duties to our nation and to mankind. You can see that the phenomena of heresy, downfall of religions, rise of new religions, the birth in Europe of a Max Müller, who expatiates upon the greatness of the Vedic philosophy, and of Bradlaughs and other infidel sons of Christian

*The Ether, the Astral Light.—[Ed.]

parents—all these are due to the fact (and also to other causes), that the individuals concerned had not in some one or other of their past incarnations, done their duty to the nations (or religions), to which they respectively belonged. A study of the times when and in the manner in which the traits of these men are brought into play should be profitable in several ways. Extending the analogy, it may be said that heartlessness, murder, cannibalism, etc., are due to failure to discharge, in past incarnations, one's duty to humanity (that is to one's self).

In conclusion it might be added that the most important element in the "Dweller of the Threshold," and in the ordeals of Chelaship, is family defects, which ought to be *first* "conquered"; then in order come national defects and the "diseases of the flesh" in general. Though all these three have to be got rid of simultaneously as far as possible, and all the three kinds of duties performed, still beginners should pay more attention to the first than to the second, and more to the second than to the third, and none of these neglected.

In those happy Aryan ages, when Dharma was known and performed fully, those men and women who did not marry, remained in the family for performing their family duties and led a strictly ascetical and Vedantic life as Brahmacharis and Kannikas (or virgins). Those alone married, who were in every way qualified for leading a grihasta (household) life. Marriage was in those days a sacred and religious contract, and not at all a means of gratifying selfish desires and animal passions. These marriages were of two kinds: (1) Those who married for the express purpose of assisting each other (husband and wife) in their determination to lead a higher life, in fulfilling their family duties, in enjoying all pleasures enjoined for such a life and thereby acquiring the means for attaining the qualifications for higher ashrama of renunciation (Sannyása), and, above all, for giving the world the benefit of children, who would become gnanis and work for humanity. Such a husband and wife might be regarded as not having in their previous incarnations been able enough to become ripe for Chelaship. (2) Those who had, in their past incarnations already fitted themselves completely for entering the sanctuary of Occultism and gnana marga (path of wisdom). One of them, the Pati (the master or "husband") was the Guru who had advanced far higher than his Patin (co-worker or pupil or "wife"). As soon as the alliance between them was made, these retired into the forest to lead the life of celibacy and practical Occultism. But, before so retiring, they had

invariably promised to their parents and other members of their family to assist and elevate them even from a distance and offered to periodically adjust* the inner life of all the relatives. I quote the language generally used in making such promises: "Whenever mother, father, sister and brothers, any of you think of me in your hour of need, wherever or whatever I may be, I solemnly promise to lend you a helping hand."

Needless to say, that such vows were conscientiously kept, and that those who were not really able to do so never made such promises nor retired from the side of their family, but chose to belong to the first class of married people. This second class of persons who thus retired into the forest and became hermits, were called Vanaprasthas. They always obtained the full consent** of their near relatives and renounced "pleasures" and material prosperity (money making, etc.).

The fourth highest order of life was complete renunciation (Sannyásis). These were the blessed few who had, then and there, in each incarnation, got out of family defects. Only those *were* admitted into this order whom the defects of no family could affect. Long before their admission into this order, they had, by fulfilling family duties, successively, incarnation after incarnation gone far beyond the reach of family defects. Brahmacharis and Kannikas could, after they had discharged family duties, become Sannyásis. All except those belonging to the second order of life, were called upon and did take a vow to give up one or more of their dearest and strongest defects.

Such, my friends, were the Laws of Manu. If any of you could establish a community on a better foundation, I should be happy to give up my allegiance to the great Sage, Saviour, and Legislator. As every Manu establishes the same Manava Dharma again and again, and as the Manus are higher than Buddha and other founders of religions, I should call upon you to pay all possible attention to this subject. Manu is higher, because he overshadows a Buddha.

I must request the readers, to study every word and the whole of this paper (if it deserves to be so called) and not tear it piece-meal or interpret passages and phrases in it, as they please. I must add, that by "family duties" I do not at all mean sacrificing your duty or conviction and Truth, to gratify the whims of selfish nature or

---

* I use the word in the peculiar sense which I have already attached to it.

**"Full consent" including the consent of all their various consciousnesses. If the Patin or Pati saw, and they ought to be able to see, that even in one of the consciousnesses of any of their near relatives there lurked a latent spark of hesitation to consent or of unwillingness, then the pair unselfishly gave up their determination to become Vanaprasthas and remained with the family until the proper time came.

sectarian views of any of your "relatives." But I use the expression "family duties" in a peculiar sense, namely, "that course and *only that course* of action, speech and thoughts by which you can not only get rid of your family defects in this very incarnation, but also strengthen in yourself all the noble qualities of your family, and which will at the same time enable your relatives (parents, brothers, sisters, wife, children, etc.,) also to get rid of *the same* defects and strengthen in themselves *the same* good qualities—so that you might be born again and again in the same family." "Patriotism" is used in a similar manner; and the article "Elixir of Life" (see *Theosophist*) should be read in the light of this paper.

The question is asked, "Has the dweller of the threshold an objective form; upon what does its objective form depend; does it always appear to everyone in the same form as it did to Glyndon in Bulwer's story?"

It is objective to those who have gone very far.

It depends upon (1) a certain thing I shall not here name; (2) the stage of development to which the chela or occultist has attained or is near attaining; (3) the mode of regarding elementals and the Dweller, peculiar to the chela or occultist, to his family and to his nation, or rather to the national and family legends or religion; (4) which form, more or less monstrous or incongruous, would be most frightful and overpowering to him at the critical period. Subject to the above four conditions, the Dweller assumes a form according to the manner in which the chela or occultist *has or has not fulfilled his threefold duties,* and according to the manner in which the sevenfold elements of the Dweller assert themselves upon him. The better he has fulfilled the threefold duties, the less does the Dweller affect him. Of course the form is not necessarily the same for everyone.

Why did the Dweller appear to Glyndon's sister, who was not undergoing probation, and why in the same form?

Because she was sympathetic and sensitive enough. The principle involved in this case is the same as in obsession.

The Dweller might either be but one elemental, or a group or several groups of elementals assuming one collective form. It is one elemental, when the crisis comes at the very commencement of the chela's or occultist's attempt to elevate his lower nature. This is the case when he has the least (Karmic) stamina for the "uphill path." The later on his path is waylaid, the more numerous are the elementals of which the Dweller is composed.

It need not be imagined that this appearance or influence confronts the chela only once until he reaches the first initiation, and an initiate only once during the interval between two initiations. It appears as

often as the stock of his Karmic stamina falls below the minimum limit.

By Karmic stamina is meant the *phala* (effect or fruit) of past unselfish, good Karma that has become ripened. Though the occultist might have an immense quantity of past unselfish good Karma stored up, still, if during his crisis there be not a sufficient number of present unselfish good thoughts to ripen a sufficient portion of that quantity, he finds himself destitute of the necessary stock of stamina. Few are they who have already laid up a good quantity of unselfish good Karma; and fewer still are they who have the requisite degree of unselfish and spiritual nature during the period of trial; and there are still fewer who would not rush for further Yoga development, without having all the requisite means.

When not qualified fully for it, we ought to and could go on developing ourselves in the ordinary way, and try to secure the necessary means by leading an unselfish life and setting an example to others, and this is the stage of nearly all ordinary Theosophists. They, in common with all their fellows, are influenced by a "Dweller," which is the effect upon them of their own, their family, and national defects; and although they may never, in this life, see objectively any such form, the influence is still there, and is commonly recognized as "bad inclinations and discouraging thoughts."

Seek then, to live the Higher life by beginning now to purify your thoughts by good deeds, and by right speech.

MURDHNA JOTI.

CONSCIOUS ASPIRATION

I know of no more encouraging fact than the unquestionable ability of man to elevate his life by a conscious endeavor. It is something to be able to paint a particular picture, or to carve a statue, and so to make a few objects beautiful; but it is far more glorious to carve and paint the very atmosphere and medium through which we look, which morally we can do. To affect the quality of the day, that is the highest of arts. Every man is tasked to make his life, even in its details, worthy of the contemplation of his most elevated and critical hour. —HENRY DAVID THOREAU.

DEVOTION OR FANATICISM?

IN his useful book, *Modern Man In Search of a Soul,* Dr. Charles G. Jung makes the penetrating observation that "intellectuals" seldom are good nurses or doctors. He might have added that an over-emphasis on intellectual activity renders a man a poor teacher, also. The typical intellectual is generally so wrapped up in his own thoughts that he neglects to study the needs of other people. He is the victim of that particular type of selfishness which demands that others adjust to *his* formula, and which has little patience with those who will not or can not so conform.

It is a curious fact of the psychic nature that minds which have highly developed analytical powers are usually quite susceptible to appeals based on emotionalism. Materialists of a certain class exhibit all the signs of fanaticism when they are requested to examine evidence that might raise doubts as to the basic assumptions of their position. Let those assumptions be accepted, and this sort of materialist will proceed to develop his argument with a persuasive brilliance that seems to overcome all objections; he has evidence to offer, and logical sequence in its presentation, so that to him, the conclusion appears self-evident. But if a line of thought be introduced which brings to view factors that he has ignored, he inevitably becomes irritated, and if without much personal discipline may even fly into a rage.

The learned faddist makes a good illustration of the psychic weaknesses of intellectualism. Lacking depth of character, the enthusiast of fads passes from one interest to another, giving to each, for a time, the devotion of his intellectual justification. The idea of progress through Right Diet may catch his fancy. He begins to demand food that contains the precious ingredients of health, and discourses to his friends on the hideous consequences of eating the wrong combinations. He eyes with pity the poor souls who appear uninterested in this new gospel he has undertaken to spread. He fills his mind with the lore of nutrition, soon being able to quote glibly a score of authorities on why a certain article of diet should, or should not, be consumed. Forgotten is the First Principle of Bodily Harmony that a year before the circle of his friends had patiently tried to understand. Walking a mile before breakfast no longer interests him, and the logical apparatus by which it was defended has been forgotten. Now there is a new truth that has captured his ardor. Next year there will be still another. But each successive interest, taken

by itself, is so cleverly justified and skillfully presented that for its cycle it appears to be the whole truth about life, to the faddist as well as the more naive of his listeners.

The explanation of fanaticism in terms of the principles of man makes a good problem for the theosophist to consider. Essentially, the fanatic, the faddist, the biased enthusiast of any cause or cult, lacks a sense of proportion. He is fascinated by an abstraction, a formula, and compensates for his loss of judgment with emotional intensity. His intellectual skill demands the support of feeling, and having no intuitive perception, he draws on the partisan principle of Desire. Every historical movement of unbalanced intellectual development reveals a fire of intolerance that can be explained in no other way. Take, for example, the Calvinist rule of the city of Geneva in the sixteenth century. John Calvin was a man of great intellectual powers. Above all, he was a systematizer, and the logic of his writings has its admirers to this day. Given the initial assumption of an omnipotent personal god, the theological conclusions of Calvin are irrefutable. The very brilliance of Calvinist theory became an apology for the fury with which he and his followers persecuted those who refused to accept it. Calvin permitted his enemy, Servetus, to be burned to death by a fire made with *green* faggots, which burned slowly and prolonged the agony.

Another illustration of one-sided intellectual achievement joined with extreme emotional intolerance is the practical issue of the movement founded by Karl Marx. Whatever the private dispassion of the Bolsheviki, and despite all claims to impersonality by the present-day Communist elite, the rise to power of the revolutionary party is due to the double influence of an intellectual formula to explain historical processes and the class hatred which is made to inflame the masses. Then there is the Freudian school of Psychoanalysis. No group of psychologists has so pretentious a body of theory, so extensive and complicated a structure of rationalizations in defense of its assumptions. At the same time, the Freudians are distinguished from other schools by their marked arrogance, dogmatism, and refusal to consider any other theory of human nature.

The peculiar blindness brought on by over-intellectuality is appreciated least of all by the intellectual himself. He spins out grandiose theories of social reform, writes great books and innumerable magazine articles, and privately bewails the stupidity of mankind who will not submit to being harnessed to carry out his ideas. He judges other men by whether they agree or disagree with him; vindication of his theory is more important by far than the immediate sufferings

of his opponents. *His* motive is beyond question; therefore, men who think otherwise *must* be evil characters full of malice and wicked design. The unbending admiration he cherishes for his own ideas is matched only by his cool disregard of the practical accomplishments of non-theoretical people who act rather than preach.

Probably the best means of overcoming tendencies to this psychism of the intellect—and every human being suffers from it in some degree—is to be confronted with the job of teaching simple people. Unpracticed minds are not helped by spectacular intellectual abstractions; they do not understand that sort of discussion, nor are they very much impressed by it. The simple man judges according to action and its fruits; he will watch how efficiently the intellectual weeds his garden before he will take the trouble to consider his ideas. This was the great lesson of harmonious development of the intellectual and moral nature that the Transcendentalists of the last century learned so well. Alcott was respected by the New England farmers because they saw he could work beside them in the field and do his part. The ideas of Emerson and Thoreau were winged with the deep integrity of their personal lives. They leavened the life of their century with their ideas because they lived them themselves. Unlike the intellectual theorists, they required no changes in other men, but worked in and on themselves, using their minds to meditate out loud on the value and rational intelligence of a life of self-discipline. The Transcendentalists were true philosophers. They realized the enormous responsibility that lay in their power over words and phrases. Intellectuality, for them, was a sacred trust.

If, before proposing a plan for social betterment, or a theory of education, the leaders and teachers of our civilization would demand of themselves some small program of personal experimentation; if they would undertake a little private project in welfare work or teaching, they might be brought to interesting discoveries as to their own sincerity, and their knowledge of human nature. Such candid self-examination would be painful, but it would also put an end to much semi-conscious hypocrisy and deception. It would stop the incalculable waste of common social resources on utterly impracticable schemes and at the same time reduce irresponsible speech-making and the unverifiable claims of politicians to a minimum. It would mean the beginning of a union of the principles of Buddhi and Manas in the fittest minds of the race, and assist in arousing the sleeping intuition of the masses.

Intellectual power is the mark of the Manasic fire, as reflected in the personal nature. Essentially, it is the capacity to think abstractly,

or impersonally. Those who have that power belong to a class of the Manasa Putra who, millions of years ago, undertook the task of brotherhood and responsibility for myriads of less experienced souls. Today, under the stultifying influence of *Kali Yuga,* all but the very few of that class of egos have fallen into habits of self-debasement; their intellectual attainments have become the means of exploiting the weaknesses and pandering to the appetites of their fellows. Brahmins and Kshatriyas alike are ruled by the motives of Vaisya and Sudra, to the progressive corruption of themselves and those to whom they stand in the relation of teachers and rulers.

It is commonly asserted that the tragedy of the present world struggle was largely caused and precipitated by the prostitution of the intellectual faculty, the instrument by which the official lies called propaganda are devised. Assuming this to be an accurate diagnosis, it should be equally clear that the tragedy will continue until the powers of mind are freed from this degrading use, and are raised to the high purposes for which the Manasa Putra originally incarnated. This is work in which theosophists, more than anyone else, should play a self-conscious and deliberate part, as men and women who can discriminate between the fanaticism of intellectuality and the true devotion of Mind and Soul.

SCOPE OF SCIENCE

When I told them that electrical science was one of the most exact of physical sciences, some shook their heads and exhibited considerable scepticism. One of them asked me: "Doctor, do you know what electricity is?" "No," said I, and he added another question: "Then how can you have an exact science of electricity when you do not even know what electricity is?"

To this I retorted: "Do you know what matter is? Of course you do not, nor does anybody else know it, and yet who will deny that there are exact sciences relating to material things? Do you deny that astronomy is an exact science?" It is a difficult thing to make unscientific people understand that science studies first and foremost the *activities of things and not their ultimate nature.*

—MICHAEL PUPIN.

THEOSOPHY AND PSYCHIC RESEARCH

I

IN February, 1940, the *Scientific Monthly* published a discussion of Telepathy by Prof. Sumner Boyer Ely, of the Carnegie Institute of Technology. The concluding sentence of this article affirmed: "We can positively say that no mind has ever yet communicated with another mind other than through ordinary sensory channels." *Dixit.* Physics had spoken. Many of the readers of the *Scientific Monthly* doubtless heaved a sigh of relief upon finishing Prof. Sumner's "survey" of Telepathy, hoping that thenceforth the irritating "superstition" of extra-sensory perception would never again be imposed upon them as a subject worthy of serious consideration. A year or so before, the well known psychologist, Dr. Joseph Jastrow, had denounced the doctrine of ESP simply because it contradicted the general scientific world-view so painfully built up by Western thinkers during the past 300 years.[1]

Despite these anathemas delivered with ill-concealed impatience by the spokesmen of scientific orthodoxy, the academic experimenters in the realm of superphysical perception have gone steadily ahead with their investigations. While their opponents have been jeering, they have been working and piling up evidence, with the result that even the "reactionary" scientific press has been forced to grant the exponents of telepathy a hearing in the sacred pages of the *Scientific Monthly.* Dr. J. B. Rhine, professor of psychology at Duke University, and prime mover in the card "guessing" experiments now being carried on in a dozen or more colleges and universities, contributed a summarizing article on the subject of Extra-Sensory Perception to the *Scientific Monthly* for November, 1940, in which the facts of past and present research are briefly set forth.

Dr. Rhine accepts the conditions of empiricism in offering his evidence. Further, to avoid the usual accusations directed at believers in psychic phenomena, he deliberately refrains from drawing any metaphysical conclusions, being content to present only the facts. He writes:

> The question whether extra-sensory perception occurs may be stated more precisely as follows: *Is it possible for a person to perceive (or respond to) objects or events without dependence on the recognized senses?* The name, extra-sensory perception (ESP), covers the essential meaning of a wide variety of terms: telepathy,

[1] See *American Scholar,* Winter, 1938-9; THEOSOPHY XXVIII, 230-32.

thought-transference, mind reading, clairvoyance, telesthesia, and cryptesthesia—to mention only the more common ones. But it is free from the special explanatory hypotheses and associations which some of the other terms have acquired.

Critics of the ESP research going on at Duke and elsewhere find peculiarly irritating the policy adopted by these workers of excluding "special explanatory hypotheses" from the reports of their experiments. When there is no attempt at explanation, but simply a bald record of factual occurrences offered, the sceptics are prevented from ridiculing the experiments as founded on "metaphysical" theories. With great care Dr. Rhine and his colleagues have abstained from making any significant hypotheses as to how ESP works. In the initial controversy over the validity of the statistical procedure in ESP research, Dr. Rhine won the support of leading American mathematicians who made the official declaration that "chance coincidences cannot explain the results obtained when selected subjects, apparently gifted with 'extra-sensory perception,' call cards which they cannot see." [2] ESP techniques being thus vindicated, the opponents of telepathy had to attack it on other grounds. Dr. Jastrow, for example, chose to condemn Dr. Rhine for his failure to "theorize":

The day is past [he wrote] when a power, agency, "faculty"—or whatever it is supposed to be in the psychic realm—so subversive as ESP can be posited, and its issues and implications developed, without giving an intelligible if speculative account of its operation. No such account is offered.

At this passage, Dr. Rhine must have laughed loud and long. He might have reminded Dr. Jastrow of the famous prayer of T. H. Huxley, "Lord, give me the courage to face a fact, even though it slay me!" for it is simply unwillingness to face the facts that makes the materialists long for theories to argue about instead. But wise from experience with deniers of the possibility of ESP, experimenters like Dr. Rhine have produced no theories, leaving that perilous occupation to others whose *a priori* conceptions of the universe are threatened by the "subversive" facts of telepathy.

Dr. Rhine's position was interestingly anticipated by Madame Blavatsky more than half a century earlier, in a discussion of the methods that scientists would find themselves constrained to adopt in their studies of psychic phenomena. She wrote:

The men of science cannot help the world to understand the *rationale* of phenomena, which for a little while longer in this cycle it will be quite impossible for them to account for, even to themselves.

---

[2] New York *Times*, Jan. 30, 1938.

> They can neither understand nor explain it, any more than anyone else can, who has not studied occultism and the hidden laws that govern nature and rule mankind. The men of science are *helpless* in this case, and it is unjust to charge them with malice, or even with unwillingness—as has been often done. Their *rationality* (taken in this case in the sense of *intellectuality,* not of *reason*) can never permit them to turn their attention to occult study. Therefore it is useless to demand or expect from the learned men of our age that which they are absolutely incapable of doing for us, until the next cycle changes and transforms entirely their *inner* nature by "improving the texture" of their spiritual minds. (THEOSOPHY VII, 234.)

This was written in 1886, a year after the attack on Madame Blavatsky by the London Society for Psychical Research. Before that tragedy of stupidity, prejudice and arrogance, she had done all in her power to guide scientists interested in psychic phenomena to the occult solution of the mysteries engaging their attention. In 1882, when the London Society for Psychical Research was formed, H. P. B. published in the *Theosophist* an editorial offering the new Society all the facilities for investigation provided by the various branches of the T. S. At that time she advocated "experimental research in the departments of Mesmerism, Psychometry, Odyle (Reichenbach's new Force), and Mediumism," calling these subjects "the keys to all the world's Psychological Science from the remotest antiquity down to the present time." She continued:

> The new Psychic Research Society, then, has our best wishes, and may count upon the assistance of our thirty-seven Asiatic Branches in carrying out their investigations, if our help is not disdained. We will be only too happy to enlist in this movement, which is for the world's good, the friendly services of a body of Hindu, Parsi and Sinhalese gentlemen of education, who have access to the vernacular, Sanskrit and Pali literature of their respective countries, and who were never yet brought, either by governmental or any private agency, into collaboration with European students of Psychology. Let the London *savants* but tell us what they want done, and we will take care of the rest. In the same connection we would suggest that the Psychic Research Society and our London and Paris Branches should open relations with the Committee of the Academy of France, just formed, or forming, to make a serious study of these very subjects, as the result of the recent experiments of Dr. Charcot, Chevillard, Burcq and other French biologists. Let us, by all means, have an international, rather than a local, investigation of the most important of all subjects of human study—PSYCHOLOGY. (*Theosophist,* July, 1882.)

It can never be said, in the face of this remarkable overture to the members of the S. P. R., that H. P. B. refused cooperation in the more "practical" aspects of the study of psychic phenomena. There was, doubtless, at that time, a unique opportunity for the scientific investigators to obtain the assistance as well as the far more important *protection* afforded by the Theosophical Movement, had the investigators been willing to work in sincere collaboration with the teachers of occult philosophy. Conceit and suspicion, however, got the better of the judgment of the leaders of the new society, causing an abrupt break between them and the line of influence represented by H. P. Blavatsky. Instead of trying to understand H. P. B., they charged her with fraud and charlatanry. After a superficial investigation carried out by an inexperienced agent, they published their conclusions without providing her any opportunity to defend herself.[3]

By its own action, the S. P. R. thus reduced the value of its researches to the unimportant level of mere compilations of the statistics of phenomena. There is no body of scientific theory less imaginative than that recorded in the *Proceedings* of the London Society for Psychical Research, and no monotony so dreary as the endless descriptions of séances reported in the pages of its publications. This karmic effect of the attack on Madame Blavatsky was not limited to psychic research in England, but spread throughout the scientific world. Nowhere has the line of investigation begun by the S. P. R. led to a single important discovery. Dr. Richard Hodgson, who was responsible for the incredibly unfair report of the London S. P. R., in 1887 became the Executive Secretary of the American Society for Psychical Research, which had been founded in Boston two years earlier by Simon Newcomb. Until his death in 1905, Hodgson served as "research officer" of the Boston Society, becoming an influential friend of American scientists and writers who were attracted by psychic phenomena. The investigations of B. O. Flower, editor of the *Arena,* carried on in the early 90's, were in collaboration with Hodgson, and William James, America's greatest psychologist, followed the work of the Boston group with interest.

Hodgson himself, who in 1885 had condemned the occult phenomena performed by H. P. Blavatsky as fraudulent, ended his life a convinced spiritualist! Hodgson's coming to America, and his influence on the psychic investigations of American psychologists, may be regarded as "symbolic" of the Karma of the scientific attempt to understand the phenomena of spiritualism. It was blighted from the

---

[3] See *The Theosophical Movement,* Chaps. V-VII.

start by the reception given to the Agent of the Theosophical Movement.

That at first there had been the possibility of cooperation between the scientists and the theosophists is evidenced by H. P. B.'s *Theosophist* editorial at the time of the founding of the London S. P. R. That the S. P. R. destroyed that possibility is clear from another article, published by H. P. B. in 1886, in which she said:

> Science, unless remodelled entirely, can have no hand in occult teachings. Whenever investigated on the plan of the modern scientific methods, occult phenomena will prove ten times more difficult to explain than those of the spiritualists pure and simple.
>
> It is, after following for nearly ten years, the arguments of many learned opponents who battled for and against phenomena, that an attempt is now being made to place the question squarely before the Theosophists. It is left with them, after reading what I have to say to the end, to use their judgment in the matter, and to decide whether there can remain one tittle of hope for us ever to obtain in that quarter, if not efficient help, at any rate a fair hearing in favour of the Occult Sciences. From none of their members—I say—not even from those whose inner sight has compelled them to accept the reality of the mediumistic phenomena. . . .
>
> Science—I mean Western Science—has to proceed on strictly defined lines. She glories in her powers of observation, induction, analysis and inference. Whenever a phenomenon of an abnormal nature comes before her for investigation, she has to sift it to its very bottom, or let it go. And this she has to do, and she cannot, as we have shown, proceed on any other than the inductive methods based entirely on the evidence of physical senses. (THEOSOPHY VII, 298-9.)

(To be concluded)

POWER OF EXAMPLE

When His Majesty, King Chularlongorn, succeeded to the throne, he was the first king of our Country to travel abroad to Europe and America. His Majesty returned to his kingdom with new ideas for its improvement. He was thoroughly influenced by the democratic spirit of President Abraham Lincoln of the United States, who believed that a nation could not progress when one-half of its people were free, the other half slaves. "Muang Thai," the name of our country, meant "the land of the free people." His majesty made a noble decision to abolish slavery in his kingdom.

—KUMUT CHANDRUNG, *My Boyhood in Siam.*

DEATH -- PHYSICAL AND ASTRAL

[The following is an extract from a lengthy discussion of this general problem, presented by H. P. Blavatsky in the *Theosophist* for August, 1885. It provides some important general statements on the obscure subject of death and the post-mortem states.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

MAN is composed of two bodies, the *internal* and the *external;* the inner one being, moreover, double, *i.e.*, having, in its turn, a semi-physical outer shell which serves as the *astral* being only during the life-time of man; while the latter is still in seeming health, the dissolution of the former, or rather of its outer shell, may have already begun. For during its captivity in the living body the "double"—or that covering of the astral form that alone survives—is too closely bound by its jailor (man), too much encumbered with the physical particles derived from the prison of flesh within which it is confined not to imperiously require, before the astral form proper is set entirely free, to be thrown off from the latter. Thus, this preliminary process of purification may be justly called "the dissolution of the *inner* man," and it begins much earlier than the agony or even the final disease of the physical man. Let us admit so much and then ask: why should we require, in such a case, in order to account for the insight some persons have of the hour of their death,—to explain the phenomenon by "revelation" from *without,* supernaturalism, or the still more unsatisfactory hypothesis of a purely physiological character as given by Hunter and Wakley, and that explain to us moreover nothing at all? During and after the dissolution of the "double,"[1] the darkness of our human ignorance beginning to be dispelled, there are many things we can see. Among these, things hidden in futurity, the nearest events of which, overshadowing the purified "soul," have become to her as the present. The "former-self" is making room for the *actual*-self, the latter to be transformed in its turn, after the final dissolution of both the "double" and the physical body into the "Eternal Ego." Thus the "*actual*-self" may pass its knowledge to the physical brain of man; and thus also we may see and hear the precise hour of our death striking on the clock of eternity. It is made visible to us through the decaying nature of our dying "double," the latter surviving us during

[1] That such dissolution *has* to precede that of the physical body, is proved to us by several things. One of these is the well ascertained *fact* (to those, of course, who believe in such facts) that the astral doubles of living men—of *sorcerers* for instance—fear steel, and may be wounded by sword or fire; their wounds, moreover, reacting upon and leaving marks and scars upon the physical shells—whereas the astral bodies of even the "Elementary apparitions"—*cannot be hurt.—Ed. Theosophist.*

a very short period, if at all,[2] and through the newly acquired powers of the purified "soul" (the higher *tetractis* or quaternary) as yet in its integral whole, and which is already possessing itself of those faculties that are in store for it, on a higher plane. Through our "soul," it is then that we see, clear and still clearer, as we approach the end; and it is through the throbs of dissolution that horizons of vaster, profounder knowledge are drawn on, bursting upon our mental vision, and becoming with every hour plainer to our inner eye. Otherwise, how account for those bright flashes of memory, for the prophetic insight that comes as often to the enfeebled grandsire, as to the youth who is passing away. The nearer some approach death, the brighter becomes their long lost memory and the more correct the pre-visions. The unfoldment of the inner faculties increases as life-blood becomes more stagnant.

Truly is life on earth like a day passed in a deep valley surrounded on all sides by high mountains and with a cloudy, stormy sky above our heads. The tall hills conceal from us every horizon, and the dark clouds hide the sun. It is only at the close of the stormy day, that the sunshine, breaking through the clefts of the rocks affords us its glorious light to enable us to catch occasional glimpses of things around, behind and before us.

"PROGRESS AND CULTURE"

People mean nowadays by a philosopher, not the man who learns the great art of mastering his passions or adding to his insight, but the man who has cast off prejudices without acquiring virtues.

—ANTOINE RIVAROL.

---

[2] When the "double" of the living man has been disintegrated before the death of man, it is annihilated for ever. When, however, death comes suddenly, it may survive the body that held it captive, but then, the process of dissolution going on outside of the dead body, the "soul" suffers, and *in its impatience tries often to throw off the particles that encumber its freedom and chain it to the earth upon the living*—says the MSS. of the Copt Terentius. The cases of accidental *deaths and suicides* are fairly described in Mr. A. P. Sinnett's *Fragments of Occult Truth* by a Lay Chela (See *Theosophist.*) Suicides fare the worst.—*Ed. Theosophist.*

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

I HAVE been wondering all week about the subject we set for discussion tonight," said Janice, "and, frankly, I think we could get a better topic than 'Christianity'. We all know what's the matter with a personal god and vicarious atonement, and isn't that about all there is to it?"

"Well," said Dave, "just what did you have in mind, King, when you suggested that perhaps we could find a 'good' side to modern Christianity, as we did to Socialism last week?"

"Well, isn't it a theoretical probability following Lawrence's constructive revelations about Socialism? I'd like to think so, considering the fact that Christianity appears to be to blame for bringing on materialism in the world in the first place. Besides, Christianity has never had any use for philosophy, and all our social customs seem to be tainted with the distorted teachings of the churches. Take dying, for instance: how can a Christian die with philosophic calm when he imagines what a horrible display his funeral is going to be? I had to go to one a little while ago which included a rendition of 'Jesus Wants Me For a Sunbeam,' by a good lady scaling close to 250 pounds. I couldn't help feeling that Jesus would vehemently deny the allegation and be inclined to sue someone for libel. Why shouldn't anyone be afraid of death if he thought his poor corpse was going to be responsible for a spectacle like that? A somewhat morbid illustration, of course, of the peculiarly warped psychology that Christianity has developed."

"If you consider just the Christian dogmas," said Dave, "you can't come to any other conclusion. They should be destroyed along with all the social habits that have grown out of them. But modern Christianity is very complex. Some of the more liberal churches are questioning both the personal god and vicarious atonement. Churches such as the Universalist, Unitarian, Congregationalist, and other groups like the Quakers, seem to be growing into a more universal attitude towards religion, and trying to generate practical thinking in the congregation. The Baptists, and the Methodists, too, have some pretty fine representatives who have tried to untangle 'the Christian spirit' from sects and creeds and to connect it with constructive social thinking."

Martinez spoke up. "On the other hand, the Catholics seem to be getting more powerful," he offered. "I've always thought that the more those churches you called 'liberal' get away from their dogmas,

the less chance they have for gaining converts—and the weaker those churches become, the more Catholicism is able to gain. I think a great number of those who feel like going to church regularly, lose interest in a minister if he says he doesn't *know* the answers to life's problems, but is only 'trying to find out'. The Catholics claim to be *sure,* and so they get more converts all the time from the majority—who don't like to think for themselves."

"I'd like to ask you a question, Dave," said Alayne. "What you said sounded as if you thought many of the Christians were really aiding the Theosophical Movement. Do you really think that's true?—because if it were, I should think you would find plenty of them ready to listen to Theosophy. I don't find it so with my friends who go to church."

"Maybe you don't know the right combination," said King. "The best approach to them must be quite a bit different from the one to use for a scientific materialist. But I don't see how any of them are helping Theosophy very much myself."

"Well," Dave replied, "I think you have to regard Christianity as a great social movement, just as you do modern science. After making the basic criticism that many of the assumptions of the scientists, like the dogmatic premises of the Christians, are erroneous, you can still see that in both cases constructive things are happening, too. The emergence of liberal Christianity is significant for one thing, because it has helped to show the success of the Theosophical Movement since 1875—the religious molds of many sincere minds have been broken and now they are groping for new light. They want that light to be in the form of religion and they turn to Christianity because it's the only religion they know anything about. But the best of them seem more interested in brotherhood and in a religious spirit than in 'authority,' so they form quite an effective opposition to the Catholic efforts to fasten medieval dogmas on the mass mind. They lose one type of convert, but the ones they keep seem to me to be pretty worth-while."

"I guess that's true," said Gail. "I was talking just the other day with a friend of mine—a reader in one of my education courses—who is going to go back to Union Theological Seminary. He's very nice and doesn't seem to be at all the impractical 'holier than thou' type that I thought would be going to divinity school. Of course, I felt it my 'Theosophical duty' to try to talk him out of his plans, but he kept telling me that while most of the things I said about Christianity were true, that was all the more reason why it needed a little more new life. Perhaps people with his intentions can really do quite a bit of good."

"I think you'd be surprised at the number of liberal Christian ministers who are less dogmatic on *all* subjects than the majority of their flock," Dave commented. "I know one, for instance, who is in the Church simply because he feels that there must be a new revival of the religious spirit, and hopes to stimulate it at a time when the world needs it as never before. He says he is a Christian just because the Church offers something to work through, and that if the new revival of religious spirit passes Christianity by and finds a new form it will be all right with him. In other words, he is interested in the essence of religion rather than in sectarianism."

"Maybe if you left old dogmatic churches out of the Christian picture," suggested Alayne, "you could say that Christianity is gradually moving towards Theosophy on one side as science is on the other."

"Yes, but will it ever amount to anything important?" asked Janice. "If they keep talking about God and prayer, won't that ruin any chance of getting close to Theosophy? Are there any signs that they are getting close at all except in a sort of 'sweetness and light' way?"

Dave thought a minute before he answered. "I know a Congregationalist minister pretty well—the one I mentioned a minute ago—who is familiar with the ideas of Karma and Reincarnation and seems to accept Karma as the necessary basis for a sort of universal religion. Then, through him, I became interested in a book by a former Dean of the Chicago Divinity School, Shailer Mathews, who died a few months ago. Mathews was at one time the President of the Federation of the Churches of Christ, and he had the ideas of Karma, universal deity, and continual evolution. Then, if you want something more particular—well, you might have noticed a reference in the magazine THEOSOPHY to an article by Leslie Belton in the English religious quarterly, the *Hibbert Journal,* where he discussed the important light that the idea of an astral, or "subtle" body, as he called it, might throw on the question of immortality. That is an application that the scientists themselves don't seem capable of making as yet, even though their discoveries of an electrical 'pattern body' within the physical are pretty well grounded. Then, too, I've seen a few issues of a magazine called *The Christian Century* which shows remarkable vitality and an excellence of literary style as well. It seems to be a genuine liberal magazine in that it recognizes the need for integrating Christian ethics with workable social programs. Many of these liberal Christians, you know, are Socialists, something that would have seemed very inconsistent a

few generations ago." Dave paused. "I shouldn't be taking up so much time," he apologized, "especially since this whole subject is discussed in the April, 1941, issue of THEOSOPHY under the title 'Christians and the Modern World'."

"You are much better informed on the subject than I am," confessed King. "I guess I'll have to acknowledge that modern Christianity is worth watching, at least. If what you say is true, the Theosophists should put forth some effort in trying to understand the Christian mind just as he does with the scientist."

"I hope that doesn't mean we have to go back and study the Bible," said Max.

"I've heard of that book," said Gail with mock solemnity, "but the Book of the Month Club has never reviewed it. Maybe we've missed something."

"Seriously," answered Dave, "I have a feeling we should know more about the Bible than we do. At least those responsible for Theosophy School seem to think so, because they've established a young people's class for comparative study of the Bible this year. Of course, my own feeling is that we don't need to be familiar with the details, but more especially with references to Reincarnation and other important Theosophical ideas. Perhaps, too, we should know something of its history and general plan. I am happy to say that the worth-while Christians I've been talking to don't seem to pay too much attention to the Bible either."

"Probably, when a Christian has an open mind," offered Gail, "he's no worse than anybody else. There must be ways for leading him on naturally to truly fundamental Theosophical ideas. For instance, this friend of mine who is planning to go to Union has the usual deep reverence for Jesus, but he is willing to share that reverence, at least to some degree, with Confucius and Buddha. And it must be a very easy step from an attitude like that to the central idea of Elder Brothers as periodic messengers, bringing the same teaching in different forms to the world, according to the need of the different cycles."

"Of course," said Dave, "we don't want to over-estimate the receptivity of even the most liberal Christians to Theosophy. They all seem to have the skandhas of orthodoxy. Their religious spirit is supported by emotions rather than by the mind, for Christianity never did have a rational basis for ethics. They still talk about 'God' and they still believe in prayer, although they don't define God and prayer the way their forefathers did. Besides, they seem to have the telltale Christian mental passivity. And therein lies a

danger, believe me! The Quakers and some of the Congregationalists, for instance, are going in for meditation along lines closely allied with Hatha Yoga, and calling this 'the new type of prayer.' And because they are mentally passive, they are wide open for psychic experiences which they will never be able to understand without Theosophy. I would say that this tendency is the real 'crisis' in modern Christianity. It looks to me as if it's going to be 'out of the frying pan into the fire' for a lot of them, unless we Theosophists get busy. The dangers of this sort received plenty of attention from H. P. B."

"I guess the first thing we should do is try to understand the Christian psychology, so that we can speak in their terms when we need to," summed up Gail. "In one sense, they must be better off than a lot of materialists, because they are really searching for something to feed the devotional part of their nature. And they must attract a lot of good minds who can't stand materialism and who strike up an alliance with Christianity because it is the only thing known to them that mentions 'spiritual values.' Well, you find there are two sides to the fence, as always. It ought to contribute to our Theosophical education to watch how both the materialists and the Christians react in various situations, and how they express themselves on moral issues."

As the others nodded thoughtfully, in agreement, the meeting came to an end.

RELIGION OF THE FUTURE

The religion which is to guide and fulfill the present and coming ages, whatever else it may be, must be intellectual. The scientific mind must have a faith which is science. . . .

There will be a new church founded on moral science; at first cold and naked, a babe in the manger again, the algebra and mathematics of ethical law, the church of men to come. . . .

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

OEDIPUS

NEAR the ancient city of Thebes, high upon the broad surface of a great rock, crouched the Sphinx. Such was her majesty that the men of olden times sometimes called her "the Sun on the Horizon."

A splendid highway led past the Sphinx into the city, yet men feared to tread it. While many were tempted by its excellence, few travelers followed this road because of the severe trial that lay between them and their destination.

Ever the Sphinx sat by the roadside, her lion's body resting, her heavenly wings rising from her shoulders, her mysterious eyes searching into the heart of each wayfarer as she asked her fateful riddle. Each passerby must stop before her. Often he trembled with fear as he saw her lips move, for all knew well the Sphinx was unrelenting. Those who were able to solve the riddle might pass safely on, but those who stammered and failed to answer, or answered wrongly, must perish.

But the Sphinx was not really cruel, and men were not right in fearing her. Had they known her better, and understood her mystery, she would have frightened them no more than the sun on the horizon. She was herself the grandest riddle of all ages—Life. Alone she kept watch over the pathway followed by the souls of men, ever asking them her eternal questions. Those who could not answer failed of their journey, for if we cannot master Life, Life masters us.

Today the Sphinx no longer sits beside the road to Thebes, the journey's ending. She has disappeared from the sight of men. This is the tale of her passing, which has come down to us through long centuries.

A traveler named Oedipus, passing by the Sphinx, was halted in his approach to the city. Before that day, no one had succeeded in guessing her riddle, but Oedipus was unafraid. Standing beneath her, he listened attentively as she asked,

"What animal is it that in the morning goes on four feet, at noon on two, and in the evening upon three?"

Oedipus bowed his head and thought. After a moment, he looked up and replied boldly,

"Man, who in childhood creeps on hands and knees, in manhood walks erect, and in old age goes with the aid of a staff."

At these words the fair face of the Sphinx clouded with extreme grief. Without uttering a sound, she cast her powerful body down from the rock and perished. Oedipus was overjoyed and thought

himself a hero. Proudly he strode on toward Thebes. He did not know that by his worldliness he had forced the Sphinx to depart from human gaze. By a false answer, Oedipus had desecrated the sublime truth she had endeavored to reveal.

Truly the saying goes, "Man, know thyself," for man contains the answer to all riddles, but thoughtless Oedipus had unriddled the man, the form, and had forgotten the God, the idea. In the morning of childhood, the body or lower man, made of *four* principles, is most active on earth; in manhood, the noon of life, the higher and lower self, the *two* aspects of man's moral nature, are dominant in turn; then, in the eventide of age, the eye of wisdom is awakened, so that the wise man has *three* eyes to guide and support him. With his facile reply, Oedipus had materialized the mystery of the riddle and concealed the great truth that man is divine wisdom incarnating on earth. He thought only of the body.

So Oedipus passed joyfully on and entered the city of Thebes. When it became known that he had vanquished the Sphinx and made safe the highway for travelers, all the city welcomed him as a great deliverer. Since their former ruler had been killed, the people made Oedipus their king. Sophocles tells the story:

For he of marksmen best,
O Zeus, outshot the rest,
And won the prize supreme of wealth and power.
By him the vulture maid
Was quelled, her witchery laid;
He rose our savior and the land's strong tower.
We hailed thee king and from that day adored
Of mighty Thebes the universal lord.

All seemed bright and well in Thebes until this ancient place, founded by Cadmus, was stricken by the plague. The priest of Zeus went to King Oedipus and said:

For, as thou seest thyself, our ship of State,
Sore buffeted, can no more lift her head,
Foundered beneath a weltering surge of blood.
A blight is on our harvest in the ear,
A blight upon the grazing flocks and herds,
. . .
Armed with his blazing torch the God of Plague
Hath swooped upon our city emptying
The house of Cadmus, and the murky realm
Of Pluto is full fed with groans and tears.
. . .
And now, O Oedipus, our peerless king,
. . .

Upraise, O chief of men, upraise our State!

. . .

Our country's savior thou art justly hailed.

Oedipus answered:

Ah! my poor children, known, ah, known too well,
The quest that brings you hither and your need.
Ye sicken all, well wot I, yet my pain,
How great soever yours, outtops it all.
Your sorrow touches each man severally,
Him and none other, but I grieve at once
Both for the general and myself and you.

Though he had destroyed the Sphinx, Oedipus was unable to free his people from this scourge. The oracle of Delphi was consulted and Oedipus learned that a single man had caused the suffering of the Thebans. As he wondered what to do, the voices of the people rose in chorus, invoking the goddess of wisdom:

First on Athenè I call: O Zeus-born goddess, defend!

. . .

From death and ruin our city to save.
If in the days of old when we nigh had perished, ye drave
From our land the fiery plague, be near us now and defend us!
Life on life downstricken goes,
Swifter than the wild bird's flight,
Swifter than the Fire-God's might,
To the westering shores of the Night.
Wasted thus by death on death
All our city perisheth.

. . .

Golden child of Zeus, O hear
Let thine angel face appear!

A seer who came to give counsel was welcomed by the king with these words:

This is man's highest end,
To others' service all his powers to lend.

But Oedipus was soon angered by the sage, who hinted that he, the king, was himself the guilty one who had laid this woe upon the people. He boasted defiantly:

When the riddling Sphinx was here

. . .

Nor sign from heaven helped thee, but *I* came,
The simple Oedipus; *I* stopped her mouth
By mother wit, untaught of auguries.

Leaving his presence, the seer told Oedipus:

none
Of mortals shall be stricken worse than thou.

. . .

I ne'er had come hadst thou not bidden me.

. . .

Thy frown I dread not, for thou canst not harm me.

As time passed, Oedipus felt growing within him a deep sense of guilt. Gradually, he realized that his own past sins, though done in ignorance, had brought the plague upon the city. Unfortunate Oedipus had unriddled but half the enigma of the Sphinx, causing her death. Now the remaining part of the mystery brought avenging retribution. All the days seemed grey and wretched to poor Oedipus. He cried out:

Oh woe is me! Methinks unwittingly
I laid but now a dread curse on myself.

No longer wishing to look upon the world he had grown to hate, Oedipus tore out both his eyes. Despised by all, he was exiled from Thebes.

The secret mystery he had ignored made him choose blindness and exile in preference to facing what he did not feel himself pure enough to encounter. Great Oedipus, the king, had unriddled the man, the form, but he had forgotten the God, the idea. In his despair, knowing not which way to turn, he cried out:

Ah me! ah woe is me!
Ah whither am I borne!
How like a ghost forlorn
My voice flits from me on the air.
On, on the demon goads. The end, ah where?
I myself must bear
The load of guilt that none but I can share.

Hapless and alone, Oedipus lived on. Years later he died in a foreign land, tended only by a faithful daughter. There men said of him:

Wail no more, let sorrow rest,
All is ordered for the best.

And in Thebes the people said:

Look ye, countrymen and Thebans, this is Oedipus the great,
He who knew the Sphinx's riddle and was mightiest in our state.
Who of all our townsmen gazed not on his fame with envious eyes?

. . .

Therefore wait to see life's ending ere thou count one mortal blest;
Wait till free from pain and sorrow he has gained his final rest.

MENTAL AND MORAL STATES

WESTERN Psychology is exclusively concerned with the tools and processes of thought, the teachers and theorists in this field believing it to be "scientific" to neglect those phases of human conduct commonly called moral. In contrast with this view is the oriental psychology of the *Bhagavad-Gita,* which is primarily concerned with moral problems, although it does not ignore the mental processes involved in thought of every kind.

Western psychology is vastly complicated by the diversity of the theories held by psychologists, as well as by the endless detail of the subject-matter it undertakes to study. Its method of research is progressively divisive, being almost entirely analytical in character, so that each direction of investigation multiplies into many others as the work of fact-finding proceeds. An unavoidable conclusion from the review of the literature of modern psychology is that it is quite impossible for any one man to master the whole of this subject, or even to keep up with contemporary discovery and thinking in its various departments. In short, the scientific student of psychology is condemned from the start to know less and less about more and more, as his science grows.

Modern psychology chooses to be non-moral in order to escape from what it conceives to be the fallacy of supernaturalism. Moral psychology would involve the idea of an inner, unitary being, who has freedom of choice. Equally necessary would be the establishment of some few norms or criteria of moral action, and this could not be done without a doctrine of the purpose of life, from which the standards would be derived. Psychologists see that there can be no real science of morality without such basic conceptions, and are unable to distinguish between *philosophical* conceptions of this order and the revealed religion with which they are familiar. A return to religion, they know, would mean the end of progress in science, and so they continue to refuse admission to their working hypotheses any moral ideas.

So far as their experience with typical religionists is concerned, the psychologists are justified in this stand. One whose faith is founded on special revelation is bound to place little interest in facts which in no way support the claim to truth made by his particular religion. The blind believer has either to ignore the facts altogether, or to devise some kind of apology for not regarding them as significant. As a matter of history, these are the alternative courses that have been followed by Christians who oppose the findings of science

as ultimate authority. The fundamentalists, for example, literally glory in their ignorance of scientific subjects, and with extensive display of virtuosity, they belittle "worldly" knowledge as of no importance to the salvation of the soul. Such Christians are the intellectual heirs of the Gregory the Great, the Pope who maintained that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion."

More sophisticated followers of the Christian religion encourage learning and the study of science, but protect their own faith from criticism with the doctrine that some truths are "above reason." An accurate account of how this process of "rationalizing" works is provided in some paragraphs by Dr. E. A. Burtt, professor of philosophy at Cornell University. They occur in a review of Reinhold Niebuhr's recently published *Nature and Destiny of Man,* first series of his 1940 Gifford Lectures. Says Dr. Burtt:

> Confident of the ultimacy of his religion of universal love, the believer in the special revelation of Christianity unwittingly substitutes a local and historical doctrine about love for love itself. In the presence of a Buddhist who finds salvation in Amitabha, he cannot allow that such an experience is on a par with his meeting the divine in Christ, and be ready to pool in friendly mutuality the distinctive greatness in each of these exalting transactions; his impulse to love without qualification is rendered subordinate to his devotion to the particular religious tradition he has inherited. And because of this primary commitment the Jesus in whom Christ was historically revealed is idealized beyond all that the evidence of the gospels can possibly justify, with consequent injustice to other great religious founders.
>
> And the champion of such a special revelation falls into self-deception. Uneasily aware that no group pretension of this kind can be valid, he zealously seeks escape from this condemning consciousness. Here is the explanation of the irrationalism accepted by the leaders of Neo-orthodoxy. Being keen thinkers and cogent reasoners, they cannot avoid a lurking realization that the norm of reason is impartiality and therefore that no form of individual or group egotism can be rationally defended. Hence they must affirm that ultimate truth is irrational, discontinuous with the normal operation of man's cognitive faculties. This is self-deception, however, because they are surely aware, at times, that whenever anything is said about God, Christ, revelation, or anything else the canons of human reason must be obeyed, under penalty of collapse into meaninglessness and total failure to communicate any idea. The rejection of reason cannot be quite sincere; it is a protective device needed to cover the anxious sense that the claims involved in the theory of special revelation are intrinsically incapable of justification. . . .

> In religion, the security that would be legitimate can only be gradually won through hospitality to all experiences that might be spiritually significant—readiness to find a revelation of the divine anywhere, that supports the quest for enduring human good. But to seek security in this way requires an emotional postponement that is difficult, an openness of mind and flexibility of spirit that are hard to achieve, a generosity and unreserved friendliness toward those outside one's inherited tradition that are as yet very rare qualities.
>
> Impatient of these difficulties, man grasps at the premature and delusive security of concentrating the whole energy of his devotion on some lovable historic figure, marking the culmination of a selected sequence of events in the past, and fanatically claims that here, in this obviously special and local scene the fullness of the Eternal and Absolute are disclosed. (*The Humanist,* Autumn, 1941.)

Prof. Burtt here applies *moral* psychology to the problem of Christian anti-rationalism, bringing to light an explanation that no amount of "scientific" psychology could have disclosed. The principle of his analysis might have been taken from *The Bhagavad-Gita:* "Those who through diversity of desires are deprived of spiritual wisdom adopt particular rites subordinated to their own natures." Believers in special revelation have simply devised justification or "rites" to conceal their own unwillingness to be impartial. And, as Dr. Burtt says, "A sound religion will teach men how to break the control of these motivating forces instead of submitting to them."

The scientific psychologist, in piling up his facts about reflex arcs and conditionings, imagines that each new fact cuts away a little more of the ground beneath the old religious psychology of soul. It is true that the development of psychology has been able to show that the Christian idea of soul, if not false, has no real contact with actual psychological experience. If a school of religious thought, or a system of philosophy makes claim to *knowledge* about the soul, it should be able to fit into its explanation *every single isolated fact* that is described by empirical science. This, however, is impossible for Christianity, for centuries ago Christianity forgot what little metaphysics was ever part of its system, and became the religion of sentiment that it is today.

With the possible exception of Buddhism, Theosophy is the only presently available system of thought that possesses the metaphysical discipline capable of unifying scientific knowledge. The theosophist need not run away from *any* fact. The works of psychological specialists—when he has the time to read them!—bring ever more and more evidence of the truth of the Theosophical philosophy. Even the findings of the most extreme schools of materialistic psychol-

ogy provide a wealth of illustration for the principles of moral psychology. When the Behaviorist claims that all human action is due to outside stimulus and response, and quotes a multitude of experiments to prove his case, the theosophist finds no difficulty in identifying the function of the lower principles of man's nature in all this evidence. The body and psychic nature of the human animal is made up of various classes of elemental lives—each a sensitive center of consciousness, and subject to the laws of its being. The basis of action in the Elemental Kingdom is precisely that claimed by the Behaviorists to apply to man as a whole. Having accepted and accounted for the phenomena on which the Behaviorist case is built, the theosophist can go on and point to evidence of another character—evidence which the mechanistic psychologist has ignored —and in this way prove that Theosophy, while rejecting none of the facts, provides a larger, truer view of life.

The scientific specialist is prone to see in his own field the "right" approach. Often he becomes impatient of the theories of others, showing little interest in studies founded on assumptions different from his own. A biologist who has devoted his life to tracing the lines of human heredity may develop into a fanatical eugenist, as a result of his concentration on *some* of the facts. Such a man has no common ground of understanding with, say, the socialist whose energies are given to isolating the economic factors in social change. The biologist thinks only in terms of *organism,* the socialist in terms of political *system;* both have raised the facts of their special fields to the status of primary causes, and are, therefore, at cross-purposes. Similarly, the psychologist whose research has led to important discoveries concerning the function of synapses tends to think that all behavior is determined by the neural switchboard of the body, becoming unresponsive to doctrines which neglect this process. Illustrations of this sort could be continued through many pages, all of them demonstrating that scientific specialization causes men to have less and less in common with respect to the central problems of human life.

The theosophist, however, is able to recognize in every special field and theory a concentration of interest at the level of one or more of the seven principles of the human constitution. With a little study he is able to render into common Theosophical explanation a group of facts which, in scientific isolation, seem at war with other bodies of ideas. Facts never conflict with each other; only human theories about the meaning of the facts are inconsistent. The theosophist never denies the facts of scientific research. He simply rearranges them according to the metaphysical pattern of his philos-

ophy, thereby quite literally bringing harmony out of chaos. And because his first principles are ethical, the immediate application of the Theosophical psychology is its strongest recommendation to those whose minds are beginning to open up—who are looking for something more fundamental than either traditional religion or science. Theosophy is religious, scientific, ethical, and *practical;* it welcomes every fact in nature and invites the challenge of the specialist to explain his discoveries.

Imagination and Disease

In Jan. "Forum" H. P. B. is quoted as saying, "This is all the secret. Half, if not two-thirds, of all our ailings and diseases are the fruit of our imagination and fears." In the same number W. Q. J. says, "The greater number are due to strong physical Karma," and "are entirely beyond the reach of imagination." [See THEOSOPHY XII, 416-17.] Will the Forum point out the reconciliation?

W. Q. J.—It is quite true that I said in reply to Q. CLXI that the greater number of diseases are those which are due to physical Karma and beyond the reach of the imagination rather than to the reaction of the imagination upon the body, and that H. P. B. in *Lucifer* said that "Half if not two-thirds of our ailings and diseases are the fruit of our imagination," but there seems to be no great contradiction since both statements were general, and in the last *Forum* mine was declared to be in respect to a rough classification and not to a specific accurate one. H. P. B.'s expression *"half if not two-thirds"* is well known to be an idiom which means much or little. It is one of those constantly used when one is not speaking of exact quantities. Hence it need not be set over against mine. But if any think it important, then let them consider that I did not say what I did as to the proportions. However, there are no statistics obtainable as to the two classes of causes for disease, and it is very evident that H. P. B. had no thought of being mathematically exact, nor was there need for her to be. Her remark was not to point out proportions but to show how strong imagination may be and how, just as I sought to point out that when the direction of the mind is altered the strain is taken off from the body and nature makes a further change, instead of our minds bringing about a state of health. A careful glance at the substantial point aimed at in the reply criticised would have revealed nothing of the nature of contradiction between the writer and H. P. B.

—*Theosophical Forum,* March, 1892.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Evidences of the Astral Body

In his annual summary of the year's achievements in science (New York *Times,* Dec. 28, 1941), Waldemar Kaempffert notes the progress in several lines of research of special interest to the theosophist. One focus of discovery is in the field of morphogenesis, where investigations of diverse character are revealing more and more of the functions of the astral body. The *Times'* science editor describes the work of Dr. Keith Porter, who, repeating the type of experiments first undertaken by Dr. Ethel Harvey (see Theosophy XXVIII, 299-300), has shown that a frog's egg will develop into a tadpole even though the nucleus of the egg has been removed. "It follows," says Mr. Kaempffert, "that more than genes are involved in the development of an embryo, as the experts on heredity have supposed. But what? There is no answer as yet."

The "Astral" Cell

Dr. Harvey obtained similar growth of an egg (of the sea urchin, *Arbacia*) which lacked both maternal and paternal chromosomes, coming to the conclusion:

> No particular type of visible and moveable granules seems essential to development; these must be concerned with metabolism and respiration. It must therefore be the "ground substance" which is the material fundamental for development—the matrix, which is not moved by centrifugal force and which, in the living egg, is optically empty. (*Biological Bulletin,* 1936, p. 120.)

This "ground substance," the structureless hyaloplasm, is the most constant and most active of all the constituents of the cell, and, according to Dr. Edmund Wilson, it "may perhaps be regarded as forming the fundamental basis of the protoplasmic system from which directly or indirectly all other elements take their origin." Clearly, the hyaloplasm is one of those "precise domains wherein the astral merges into physical evolution," referred to by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 257).

"Chemistry of Life"

Mr. Kaempffert could find his "answer" there, were he inclined to look in that direction. His work, however, seems rather to be in the assembling of facts. Under the heading, "Chemistry of Life," he reports an effect of the new "miracle" drug, sulfanilamide:

> It has long been known that X-rays, abnormal temperatures and numerous chemicals will influence the development of plants. Many of the cells of plants, when treated with sulfanilamide, suddenly split into two or more identical cells and often produce giant plants. "Polyploidy" is the name of the process.

He adds that "Similar effects have not been obtained in animals," for which we may be grateful. If ever the human race is attacked by mosquitoes grown to the size of mastodons, it will be as just karmic retribution for our attempts to tamper with the natural processes of evolution in the animal kingdom.

"Magicians of the Future"

Each new discovery in biochemistry brings to the theosophist further evidence of the progressive "physicalization" of occult powers which were once the common psychological endowment of the human race. The capacity of the adept to control the growth of plants by stimulating or retarding the flow of vital energy from his own organism to the plant is now emerging as an external power of the "yoga" of chemistry. Not without reason did H. P. B. write: "Chemistry and physiology are the two great magicians of the future, who are destined to open the eyes of mankind to the great physical truths." Mr. Kaempffert continues:

> Dr. H. P. Traub (U. S. Department of Agriculture) found that the sulfa compounds acted as growth-regulators of plants and hence like hormones. In the normal process of growth the nucleus enlarges, then splits in two. The sulfa compounds interfere with this process. The cell is prevented from dividing, so that they are enclosed in a common skin. Occasionally, Dr. Traub noted distortions in the shape of cells, indicating that not all were equally affected, so that the result was like that of a virus disease.

Hormonic Magic

The real cell, as W. Q. Judge points out in the *Ocean,* is the ideal or astral pattern, and any influence which is capable of changing or distorting the proportion of the cell must exercise its power on the astral plane. Thus cancer, believed by some to be a virus disease, is peculiarly astral or psychic in genesis. Biochemistry is rapidly becoming the science of astral essences. Of this, Mr. Kaempffert gives further evidence:

> Dr. P. W. Zimmerman (Boyce Thompson Institute) produced seedless tomatoes from unpollinated flowers and even from unopened buds by sprays of a growth-producing substance, beta-napththoxyacetic acid, so that we have another case of a hormone-like effect produced by a chemical.

ASTRAL FACTORS

Hormones, it may be noted, are the secretions of the endocrine or ductless glands, by means of which the metabolic processes of the body are regulated. A passage from a biology text will assist in indicating the essentially *astral* character of hormonic control:

> The almost uncanny potency of hormones in general is evident from the estimate that about 1/1,000th of a gram of thyroxine is sufficient to induce a 2 per cent increase of the total oxidation of the adult human body. The amount of thyroxine required by the body during a whole year is probably about 2½ grams, while the amount in use at any one time is approximately 2/10th of a gram. "But this pinch of material spells all the difference between complete imbecility and normal health"—a fact that should give pause not only to the biologist but also to the sociologist. (L. L. Woodruff, *Foundations of Biology,* p. 184.)

Facts of this sort may also give the theosophist to think about the psycho-biological mechanisms of karmic action, and the endless correlations that obtain between the mental and moral states and the physical processes which are their reflection in matter.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MAN AND APE

An anthropological note in the *Times* survey of the year in science confirms the contention of Henry Fairfield Osborn that man's ancestors were not tree-climbing apes. Mr. Kaempffert says:

> If Dr. William Strauss, Jr., (Johns Hopkins) is right, man's ancestors did not swing from limb to limb in forests. He studied forearm flexor muscles in gibbons, orangs, gorillas, chimpanzees and men and found "a community of origin for man and the anthropoid apes." But human arm muscles stand apart, he decided. Because they do, he takes no stock in theories of an ancestor that lived in trees.

Osborn, while believing that the archaic ancestors of man passed through an arboreal stage, refused to identify the line of human evolution with that of the anthropoids. Writing of this hypothetical arboreal period, he said:

> I believe that this stage did not progress so far as to carry man into a stage approaching that of the anthropoid apes. Dollo has stated the law of the irreversibility of evolution. The brachiating hand of the ape was used as a hook—apes do not grasp a branch with the fingers and thumb but hook the whole hand over the branch, as trapeze workers do today—and the thumb was therefore a grave danger. If man had gone through a prolonged period of brachiating in the branches of trees he would have lost his thumb. . . . I predict that even in Upper Oligocene time we shall find pro-men, and if

> we find Oligocene pro-man—in Mongolia, for example—that he will have pro-human limbs, not pro-anthropoid ape limbs. (*Science,* May 20, 1927.)

In connection with the views of these scientists it would be useful to read the section comparing human and anthropoid anatomy in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 680-83).

Astrology—"On Closer Consideration"

John J. O'Neill, science editor of the New York *Herald Tribune,* reports an interesting development in the scientific view of astrology. The incident involves Prof. Bart J. Bok, of Harvard Observatory, the international clearing house for astronomical information. Says Mr. O'Neill:

> Dr. Bok, at a meeting held two weeks ago at the American Museum of Natural History, delivered a lecture on astrology. A year ago he made on astrology a scathing attack, based largely on a study of quacks and racketeers. In the meantime he made a more extended study of the work that is being done in statistical astrology—that is, the study of large groups of individuals instead of single individuals. This approach, he declared, is scientific and should be encouraged. He pledged support of himself and his astronomical colleagues to further such a research program.
>
> Commenting on the work of Carl Payne Tobey, who organized the Bureau of Astrological Statistics, Professor Bok said: "Mr. Tobey believes firmly in astrology and is willing to do the statistical work, to test for the broad influences of the planets, to show accurately how those influences work."

A "Sincere Group"

> "The American Federation of Scientific Astrologers," he said, "represents what we consider the most sincere group trying to inject the scientific method into astrology." Dr. Bok proposed that a committee be formed, half astrologers and half scientists, to formulate a program of research.
>
> There has been a rapid growth in interest in astrology since 1900 and it is more powerful now than at any time in history, he said. This alone, he added, would be one reason for making a thorough scientific examination of the subject. (New York *Herald Tribune,* Dec. 7, 1941.)

If scientists, following the lead of Dr. Bok, will give impartial attention to the claims of astrology, at the same time maintaining their psychic equilibrium when they discover that not all of astrology is "superstition," we may hope for a sudden lessening of the authority of traditional materialism. But theosophists should never

lose sight of how scientists who were converted to Spiritualism during the last century forgot entirely, in the process, the strict discipline of their professional method and became blind believers in the doctrine of the "Summerland of Spirit" where dwell the dear departed. There is no particular value in urging scientists on to recognition of the phenomenal aspects of superphysical realms, or of the occult influences of the planets. This will come in good time, as the cycle matures. The present need of science is ethics and metaphysics. Altruism in motive and philosophic discipline in thought are the qualities that scientists and all others will require to maintain stability during the coming cycle of psychism.

PSYCHIC RESEARCH BECOMES "RESPECTABLE"

It has often been predicted in the pages of this magazine that the time would come when orthodox scientific journals would talk learnedly of psychic phenomena as though the possibility of their existence had always been admitted in scientific circles. That time has arrived. The *Medical Record* for Oct. 15, 1941, reviews *Fifty Years of Psychic Research* (London, 1939) by Henry Price, referring to the latter as "an authority on psychical research." Despite Mr. Price's claim that "he has seen one living full form materialization," the reviewer does not accuse him of being "a gullible believer." His conclusions are spoken of as being "valuable," although the *Medical Record* is not committed to accepting the reality of psychical phenomena. The author's explanations of "hauntings" is given as follows:

> "An emanation of our ego or personality," or a part of our intelligence, persists after death, and can be picked up by a suitable mind attuned to that emanation." He interprets his "emanations" theory in this manner. There is, he says, a periodicity about hauntings which tend to occur after regular and fairly constant intervals and suggests that a room or place may become saturated with the emanation of a dead person which "increases" or accumulates in the same way as a storage battery, and when accumulations have reached saturation point beyond which they can go no further, they burst into phenomena, when the so-called "battery" gradually goes again through the process of storing. As a matter of fact there is no theory which covers more than a few atoms of the phenomena to be explained.

A PSYCHIC RESEARCHER ON PLOTINUS

So far as it goes, this explanation is consistent with the Theosophical teaching regarding after-death states. But it is only a beginning, as the reviewer notes. Actually, the only theories with any real com-

petence to explain the various phases of supernormal phenomena are those which derive either directly from Theosophy or from the teachings of the Neoplatonists. A paper printed in the *Proceedings* of the London Society for Psychical Research (1927, xxxvi, pp. 393-413) shows in great detail the application of Plotinian psychology to the phenomena of the séance. According to the writer, Mr. G. W. Lambert:

> The student who adopts Plotinus' far-reaching theory of the nature of man's psychical constitution, with its immense range and organic structure, will find that it throws new light on many current problems. He will, however, find himself more than ever impressed with the difficulty of establishing the identity of "communicators." The question whether a given "communicator" is identical with some particular deceased individual raises the whole question of the structure of the two personalities one is attempting to identify. Both Plotinus and Frederic Myers were profoundly right in making a theory of human personality the groundwork of their theories of survival, and many of the difficulties experienced in co-ordinating the data of research are no doubt due to imperfect and one-sided theories of personality. Plotinus' theory at any rate gives us a scale by which to classify the various kinds of identity tests which are applied to trance personalities.

Principles of Classification

Any adequate psychology of psychic phenomena must include, not only a "theory of personality," but also a metaphysics of the after-death states, such as Mr. Judge provides in his description of *Kama Loka,* the nature of the *Kama Rupa,* and his classification of the various types of shells which inhabit the astral plane. The value of the Theosophical system should be evident to the spiritualistic experimenter, who ought to realize that no amount of phenomena could by itself suggest the necessary principles of classification. But once given the principles, their application is clear. Mr. Lambert continues:

> Looking at the matter from the Plotinian standpoint, the tests fall into four categories.
>
> (1) In the lowest class come those tests which measure and compare psycho-physical reactions not under conscious control, such as pulse rates and psycho-galvanic reflexes. If individual reflexes are highly characteristic, it would be interesting to have them recorded, in order that they might be compared with those of any controls who, after the death of the person under observation, claimed identity with him. It may be that reactions normal in one body are not easily reproducible in another, but judging from the curious physio-

logical manifestations displayed by some controls, the results might be distinctly interesting.

(2) Next in order would come characteristic mannerisms of speech and so forth which impress some sitters very strongly. But Plotinus would never have accepted these as proof of the survival of more than the body-subconscious soul "compound," (i, l. 10.) in which habits of all kinds are registered. They would not necessarily prove the continued activity of the "higher soul."

"INCONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE"

(3) In the third class come tests based on comparisons of memories. I have already pointed out that, according to Plotinus, the more intellectual type of mind loses detailed earth memories after death, (iv, 3. 27.) and he would not have been at all surprised at the serious failures of memory displayed by certain of the controls claiming identity with important members of his Society who have died and since purported to communicate. This possibility, coupled with our ignorance of the range of clairvoyance and telepathy, makes memory tests a very inconclusive kind of evidence, whether they are apparently successful or the reverse.

(4) In the highest class we must place those tests which rely on showing, on the part of controls or communicators, continued intellectual powers of a high order, which are also "characteristic" such as those originating correlated scripts of a complicated and ingenious type, like the "Ear of Dionysius" case. (Proc. S.P.R., vol. xxix, p. 197 ff.)

Looked at from the Plotinian standpoint, each of these tests taps the problems, as it were, at a different psychological level. None of the types of test is open to a quite unambiguous interpretation, but if a control, purporting to be a deceased individual, successfully passed tests in each of the four categories mentioned above, the cumulative evidence of survival would be very strong. Unfortunately there is a tendency on the part of experimenters to specialize on one type of test; this circumstance, in its turn, tends to limit the psychical "education" of mediums, and the result is a mass of data more difficult to coordinate than would have been the case if they had been collected over a wider psychological range.

"SPIRIT COMMUNICATION"?

The writer of this article is quite apparently a Spiritualist. From the concluding passage of the seventh book of the fourth *Ennead* he cites the following statement, which is assumed to be proof that Plotinus believed in the genuine "spirit communication":

"Thus far we have offered considerations appropriate to those asking for deductive proof; those whose need is conviction depending

on observation are best met from the abundant records relevant to the subject: . . . There are (he proceeds) not a few souls, once among men, who have continued to serve them after quitting the body, and by revelations, practically helpful, make clear as well that other souls, too, have not ceased to be." (iv. 7. 15.)

A Reference to Nirmanakayas

To the Theosophist, this passage is simply evidence of Plotinus' familiarity with the doctrine of Nirmanakayas, and not at all an indication that he believed in the spiritualist theory attributed to him by Mr. Lambert. The latter's analysis does, however, show that the Plotinian psychology comprehended the various classes of "shells" discussed in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* and it makes abundantly clear the truth of H. P. B.'s statement that the present Theosophical Movement is a "reincarnation" of the Neoplatonic cycle begun in the third century by Ammonius Saccas.

Neoplatonism and Theosophy

While this exposition of Plotinus by Mr. Lambert is illuminating to the Theosophist, his own spiritualistic conclusions are striking evidence of the need of Theosophy as a key to the works of ancient writers. Without the definitive statements of H. P. Blavatsky, her explanations and her warnings, it is impossible for modern scholars to understand the Theosophical teachings of ages past. It might have been a reincarnated Plotinus who wrote in the nineteenth century:

> Theosophy—owing, in truth, to the *levée in arms* of all the Spiritualists of Europe and America at the first words uttered against the idea that every communicating *intelligence* is necessarily the Spirit of some ex-mortal from this earth—has not said its last word about Spiritualism and "Spirits." It may one day. Meanwhile, an humble servant of theosophy, the Editor, declares once more her belief in Beings, grander, wiser, nobler than any *personal* God, who, nevertheless, *do* condescend in all and every age to occasionally overshadow rare sensitives—often entirely unconnected with Church, Spiritualism or even Theosophy. And believing in high and holy Spiritual Beings, she must also believe in the existence of their opposites—lower "spirits," good, bad and indifferent. Therefore does she believe in spiritualism and its phenomena, some of which are so repugnant to her.

Theosophists, more fortunate than scholars, realize that it is necessary to study the contemporary "incarnation" of the Wisdom Religion, if right applications of its teachings are to be made.

THE "COSMIC ANIMAL"

The basic ideas of the Theosophical philosophy are slowly finding new channels of expression through thoughtful men of the educational world. Dr. Charles Hartshorne, associate professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago—where Robert M. Hutchins is president—has proposed to a convention of scientists that "the entire universe is a unified, living organism, with a mind composed of all living individuals." (New York *World-Telegram,* Oct. 19, 1941.) In this radical unity Dr. Hartshorne finds the basis for a philosophy of brotherhood:

> This conception of the ultimate, or cosmic organism, is the remedy for two great errors of political thought—abstract individualism and abstract collectivism. Neither the human individual nor any human class, race or group is an absolute end, but only that whole in which men and nations and all existences have their place and value. We are members one of another because we are members of one ultimate body-mind—one inclusive, unborn and imperishable organism.

Students will recall that the universal "mind-stuff" which Theosophy calls the *Akasa* is the root-principle of unity in diversity. In his preface to the *Aphorisms* of Patanjali, Mr. Judge said:

> The Universal distribution of this (ethereal medium) as a fact in nature is metaphysically expressed in the terms "Universal Brotherhood" and "Spiritual Identity." In it, through its aid, and by its use, the qualities and motions of all objects are universally cognizable.

PURPOSE OF THE WHOLE

As evidence of the organic unity of the cosmos, Dr. Hartshorne points out that "nothing happens anywhere but its effects are communicated with the speed of light in all directions." This is indeed an ancient illustration. "As a single sun illuminateth the whole world, so doth the One Spirit illumine every body." What of cosmic purpose?

"The answer, of course," Dr. Hartshorne tells us, "is that the purpose of the organism would be the prosperity of the whole." From the unity of the whole he reasons to the conclusion that great nature is its own "purpose."

> Any group short of the universe can break up, fall to pieces in all sorts of ways and degrees. But from the cosmic community there is no succession. There is nowhere to go from the universe. It is the only aggregate which is entirely its own foundation. This fits to

> perfection the idea that it is its own reason or purpose and the integration of all purposes.

Here Dr. Hartshorne says, somewhat obscurely, perhaps, that the purpose of life is to learn, the great lesson being the unity of all. The affinity of these conceptions with the Theosophic teachings regarding deity and law should be apparent to students. The same great ideas have been taught by all great philosophers down the ages, from Plato to H. P. B. Lacking, of course, in Dr. Hartshorne's philosophy of organism is any real explanation of the origin of evil, and therefore, any practical basis for ethics. He teaches a metaphysics which covers the "total" problem, but has nothing to satisfy the questions of the individual who longs for more intimate understanding of the life that is uniquely his. How are his daily joys and sorrows related to "cosmic prosperity"? To answer this question, Dr. Hartshorne might consider the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation; he would find that they fit perfectly into his general scheme.

"O, Principle of Integration"!

The brave effort of a number of Christian thinkers to be "liberal" and to adopt some of the criteria of science in formulating their faith has produced several interesting effects in modern religious thought. It should be realized that to be "liberal" in religious thought means to be *uncertain* as to what is religious truth. For who except the Fundamentalist can feel that he "knows" that Christianity is true and in what sense it is true? Thus, whatever the good results of liberal Christianity, in broadening the outlook of the leaders of this movement, it has by repercussion driven numerous other Christians back into the fold of orthodoxy and more or less literal acceptance of Bible revelation, as the sole alternative to unbearable doubts concerning the nature of things. Some passages from a recent review of a new liberal work on Christian theology will indicate the criticisms that are offered by those who rest their faith on the ultimacy of Christian revelation. The book is *What We Can Believe,* by Randolph C. Miller, of which the reviewer says:

> . . . the treatments of the church, of prayer and of the Kingdom of God are very inadequate. The inadequacy at these points probably stems from that vagueness about the nature of God which the author shares with his fellow empiricists. This weakness of empiricism at the very heart of the theological problem accounts for the growing revolt in recent years against the empirical method and the consequent rise of neo-orthodoxy.

> Apparently Dr. Miller sees this, for he admits that it would be absurd to pray, "O, Principle of Integration." But the bugaboo of anthropomorphism compels him to take refuge in analogy and symbols with the result that in the end God emerges as "a kind of holy blur," personal but not a Person, like a father but not the Father, a value-producing factor but not the Valuer, a process or activity of the cosmos but not a separate metaphysical entity. (*Christian Century,* Jan. 7.)

FAILURE OF CHRISTIANITY

Readers can understand, while deploring, the neo-orthodox reaction to liberalism of this type, which is neither scientific empiricism nor whole-hearted theism, but a confusing compromise between these fundamentally opposed views of life. The growing uncertainties of modern life are precipitating a crisis in the moral experience of many of those whose outlook is essentially religious, with the result that the appeal of dogmatic certainty is becoming more and more attractive to them, despite the flight from reason that blind belief involves. While from one point of view, the neo-orthodox movement marks a stirring of the religious instinct in man, its more important signification is the tendency to sacerdotalism and the futile attempt to re-animate the ancient shell of Christian dogma. Both modern liberalism and neo-orthodoxy in the Christian religion are simply evidence of the woeful ignorance of our civilization, adding their tragic testimony to the statement of a Theosophical Teacher, set down in the last century:

> The world in general, and Christendom especially, left for 2,000 years to the *régime* of a personal God, as well as to its political and social systems based on that idea, has now proved a failure. . . . That the world is in such a bad condition, morally, is a conclusive evidence that none of its religions and philosophies, those of the civilized races less than any other, has ever possessed the TRUTH. The right and logical explanations on the subject of the problems of the great dual principles, right and wrong, good and evil, liberty and despotism, pain and pleasure, egoism and altruism, are as impossible to them now as they were 1880 years ago. They are as far from the solution as they ever were; but to these problems there must be somewhere a consistent solution, and if our doctrines will show their competence to offer it, then the world will be the first to confess that *ours* must be the true philosophy, the true religion, the true light, which gives truth and nothing but the TRUTH. (THEOSOPHY X, 71-2.)